

SUBHĀṢITA-SAMGRAHA-S AND INSCRIPTIONS
AS SOURCES OF SANSKRIT POETRY

Aim of the Study

1.1. A great part of Sanskrit poetry is lost and has not yet been recovered. It is quite unknown how many such works disappeared. Many of them are only known by their titles but none of their MSs. could be found, (e.g. *Lāvaṇyavatī-kāvya* or *Citrabhārata-nāṭaka* of Kṣemendra, quoted by the author in the *Aucityavicāracarcā* and the *Kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa*); but many are not even known by their titles and no one knows how many more poetical works existed. Fortunately, a part of this poetry, though very small, was preserved in *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* and inscriptions. Particularly, through *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*, anthologies of beautiful detached verses, the poetry of known and unknown poets was rescued from oblivion.

1.2. By the end of the nineteenth century, Th. Aufrecht in his studies *Auswahl der uneditierten Strophen verschiedener Dichter*¹ and, in particular, *Beiträge zur Kenntniss indischer Dichter*² has edited and published some verses of known and unknown Sanskrit poets known only from *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*. Later, in 1912, F.W. Thomas, in the introduction to his *Kavīndravacanasammuccaya* and J.B. Chaudhuri in the introductions to his editions of PdT., SSS. and PV. gave lists of some poets mentioned in *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* with the *pratīka-s*³ of some of their verses. However, these lists are not only incomplete, but also contain only information on some poets, i.e. those mentioned in the *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* treated by them — Kav., PdT., PV., SSS. and SuSS. In the meantime, many new anthologies were found and edited and, consequently, many new authors and their verses came to light.

1. ZDMG. 16.749-51; 25.238-243; 455-462.

2. ZDMG. 36. 361-383; 509-559. See also O. Böhtlingk, *Bemerkungen*, ZDMG. 36.659-660.

3. But not the entire first *pāda*.

1.3. On the basis of all anthologies known up to date, it is possible to reconstruct a great part of Sanskrit poetry, hitherto unknown, a poetry of many authors whose verses are sometimes of great poetical value.

1.4. Only those *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* which contain ascriptions to individual poets or « signed verses » can be taken into account as source for the reconstruction of the poetry written by individual Sanskrit poets. They quote not only verses of unknown poets, but also never published before poetry of known authors or « new » verses, as well as anonymous verses (*kasyacit, kasyāpi*); the latter also enrich our knowledge of Sanskrit hitherto unknown Sanskrit poetry, but cannot be assigned to any particular author.

Sources: Subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s

2. Already in the fourteenth century, Viśvanātha in his *Sāhitya-darpaṇa*, has defined the *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* as compilations of stray verses arranged according to divisions (6.308; p. 565 and added: « that is particularly beautiful ». *Subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* are representative of the *muktaka*-poetry; they are composed either of ethical and didactic verses, usually written in short metres (*anuṣṭubh-s, upajāti*), or of lyrical and descriptive verses written in longer metres (*vasantatilaka* to *sragdhara*), or they are collections of both kinds of verses, i.e. mixed *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*. For the reconstruction of lost or unknown Sanskrit poetry, the latter two sorts of *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* are the most important ones.

3. From the eleventh or twelfth century, until present day, it was, and still is, in vogue to compile collections of stray verses known and popular at the time and in the regions where the compiler was, or is, active. This permitted to preserve the poetry of known and unknown poets which would have completely disappeared if it would not be saved by the compilers of *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*. They have not only preserved the poetry of authors contemporary to them but also the precedent poetry. This poetry, vividly depicts the spirit of an age, the task and ability during various periods, country life, life in a village, different occupations of men and women, their habits and manner, their activities, etc. and all what at the time of their compilation was considered as moral and just, sometimes better and with a deeper insight than the quotations of *kāvya-s* and epics. Thus, *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* are not only treasuries of Sanskrit poetry but also reflections of conditions existing at the time and in the regions when and where the compiler prepared his work.

4.1. It goes without saying, that *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* could contain only the poetry which existed already at the time of their compilation⁴.

4. Some *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* are even clearly dated.

Consequently, the verses included in the *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* could not have been written after the composition of the *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* in which they are included. Thus, we can consider the date of the composition of the *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* as the date *ad quem* the poet cited in them could have lived. This is of great importance for the history of Sanskrit literature, since in this way it is possible to fix the date of the activity of some Sanskrit poets.

4.2. And so, for instance, a poet cited in Skm. (which was composed in 1205) had to be active before that date. Consequently, we can rectify the date of the activity of Kāñcana, son of Nārāyaṇa Vāgīśvara and author of Dhanāñjayaviṇaya Vyāyoga. According to NCC3., he lived before 1431, since the oldest MS. of his work was dated 1431. Now, it is possible to consider him as an author who could not have lived after 1258 (and not 1431), since one of his verses is quoted in Jalhaṇa's Sūkti-muktāvalī which was composed, at the latest, in 1258.

5.0. On the other hand, if the date of the composition of a *subhāṣita-saṁgraha* is uncertain, but certain is the date of the author whose poetry was included in such a *subhāṣita-saṁgraha*, it is possible to fix the date of this anthology.

5.1. And so, for instance, on the basis of the known date of Kavī-rakṣasa (end of the fourteenth and beginning of the fifteenth century) a verse of whom was included in SRHt. V. Raghavan has rectified the date of this *subhāṣita-saṁgraha* and concluded that it was composed at the beginning of the 15th century⁵ and not, as it was suggested before, in the second half of the 14th century.

5.2. It should be, however, underlined that verses included in *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* could have been interpolations. There is no doubt, for instance, that verse ŚP. 1303 attributed to Kṣemendra, is a later interpolation in ŚP., which could not have been composed after 1363. This verse utilizes the word *beṭī*, a word which does not belong to classical Sanskrit of the 11th century⁶ but is an idiom current in later times⁷ than the 14th century.

6.1. *Subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* can also prove that the authors known in Sanskrit literature only as authors of theoretical treatises, were also good poets. And so, Amarasiṁha, who is known only as a famous lexicographer was also the author of *subhāṣita-s*; eleven such verses of his are found, for instance, in SkV. (Kav., Prasanna.), Skm. and Vidy. Also Pāṇini was not only the celebrated grammarian but also the author of some lyric verses, since his verses were quoted in SkV. (Kav., Prasanna),

5. JOR (Madras) 19.155.

6. The date of Kṣemendra's activity.

7. Hindi *beṭī*. V.M. Mayrhofer, *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des altindischen* 14.449.

Skm., JS., ŚP., VS., Pad., and RJ. Though it is not yet determined whether Pāṇini, the author of the grammar, is identical with Pāṇini, the author of lyric poetry, it seems to be certain that Amarasimha, the lexicographer, is also the author of stray verses included in *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*, since Śulikanātha quoted in SkV. (1724) and Skm. (1132) state clearly that Amarasimha is known as poet and lexicographer⁸.

6.2. *Subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* can also be of use for the identifications of some poems⁹.

7. It is fortunate that all the *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* which contain ascriptions and, thus, useful as sources of Sanskrit otherwise unknown poetry, can be dated. There are twenty such *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* which are quoted here chronologically:

Name of the <i>subhāṣita-saṁgraha</i> :	Date of its composition:	SGD. ¹⁰ :
Subhāṣita-ratna-koṣa of Vidyākara (SkV.) ¹¹	cca. 1100-1130	15
Sad-ukti-karṇāmṛta of Śrīdharadāsa (Skm.)	1205	16
Sūktimuktāvalī of Jalhaṇa (JS.) ¹²	1258	17
Śārṅgadhara-paddhati (ŚP.)	1363	17
Subhāṣita-sudhā-nidhi of Sāyaṇa (SSSN.) ¹³	second half of the 14th century	19

8. Differently SkV. p. lxx.

9. Several poems were wrongly ascribed to Kālidāsa, e.g. the Śṛṅgāratilaka and the Ghaṭakarpāra. In Skm. dated 1205 one verse (*āyātā madhuyāmini vi*) was culled from the Śṛṅgāratilaka (2); this verse was ascribed, however, not to Kālidāsa, but to Indraśiva, an otherwise unknown author. It is, therefore, possible that it was not Kālidāsa, who was the author of the Śṛṅgāratilaka, but Indraśiva. Also one verse from the Ghaṭakarpāra-kāvya *kiṅkṣamāpi tava nāsti* is not attributed in SG. to Kālidāsa, but to Ghaṭakarpāra. It is, therefore, possible that Ghaṭakarpāra, and not Kālidāsa, was the author of this *kāvya*-work. Although the ascriptions do not have a great weight, they prove that, at the time when they were composed, the two *kāvya*-works were generally considered as having been composed by Indraśiva and Ghaṭakarpāra respectively.

10. The anthologies were described and their probable dates of composition were given in SGD.

11. Refers also to Kav. and Prasanna. (SGD. pp. 15 and 16).

12. See also note 19.

13. SRHt. and SSSN. seem to be two versions of the same work. See also note 19.

Sūktiratnahāra of Sūrya (SRHt.) ¹⁴	second half of the 14th century	19
Subhāṣitāvalī of Vallabhadeva (VS.)	15th century	22
Prasannasāhityaratnākara of Nandana (Prasanna.) ¹⁵	15th century	16
Padyāvalī of Rūpa Gosvāmin (PG.) ¹⁶	End of 15th, beginning of 16th century	23
Śṛṅgārālāpa (SLP.)	1612	26
Padyaracanā of Lakṣmaṇa-bhaṭṭa Āṅkolakāra (Pad.)	1625-1650	27
Subhāṣitahārāvalī of Harikavi (SH.) ¹⁷	Second half of the 17th century	24
Rasika-jīvana of Gadādhara-bhaṭṭa (RJ.)	17th century	27
Sabhyālaṅkaraṇa of Govindajit (SG.)	after 1656	28
Padyavenī of Veṇīdatta (PV.)	1644 or 1701	20
Sūkti-sundara of Sundaradeva (SSS.)	1644-1710	20
Padyāmṛta-taraṅgiṇī of Haribhāskara (PdT.)	1674	28
Subhāṣita-sara-samuccaya (SuSS.)	End of 17th century	38
Subhāṣita-savaskṛta(?)-śloka (Regnaud II, VI)	18th or 19th century	38
Vidyākaraśahasaka of Vidyākara Miśra (Vidy.)	19th century	29 ¹⁸

14. See fns. 13 and 19. If it is admitted that Kavīrakṣasa quoted in SRHt. is the same author who lived at the end of the 14th and beginning of the 15th century (see para 5.1), the date of the composition of SRHt. should be fixed accordingly. After this article was written, I came to the conclusion that SSSN. and SRHt. were later than VS., for references to Vallabhadeva in SSSN. and SRHt. did not refer to the author Vallabhadeva but to the VS.

15. See fn. 11.

16. See fn. 19.

17. See fn. 19.

18. Garuḍa-purāṇa, i.e. the Bṛhaspita-saṁhitā of the Garuḍa-purāṇa can also be considered as a *subhāṣita-saṁgraha* composed in the first place of verses of the Cāṇakya-rāja-nītiśāstra version. This work was translated into Tibetan and included in the Tanjur in the 10th-11th century.

8.0. These *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* have some common features from the historical and from the geographical point of view.

8.1. From the historical point of view, they can be divided into classical and older and into some younger *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*. The classical *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*, i.e. the first nine anthologies contain often the same verses¹⁹; and the younger *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* quote mostly verses of contemporary to them and immediately preceding them authors²⁰. In addition, many verses in the *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* of the second category, are identical and occur only in these *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*. In particular, PV., PdT., SSS. and SuSS. and partly RJ. and SG., contain mostly identical verses, so that it is rarely possible to find in SSS. or PdT. verses which do not occur also in PV. and SuSS.

8.2. From the geographical point of view, many *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* compiled by authors from a certain geographic region, quote in the first place authors from that region. And so, Śrīdharaḍāsa, the compiler of Skm., quotes in particular verses of Bengalese authors²¹, so also Rūpa Gosvāmin, the author of PG.²² Vallabhadeva and Vidyākara, both from Kāśmīr, and authors of VS. and SkV. respectively, quote, in particular, Kāśmīrian authors²³; Vidyākara Miśra, the compiler of Vidy., verses of authors from Mithilā²⁴, while Sūrya, the compiler of SRHt., quotes particularly verses from South India, or South Indian versions of known works²⁵.

19. Among these *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* also PG. and SH. were counted. PG. is a very specific *subhāṣita-saṁgraha* different from others; it contains a great number of devotional verses, since its author was Rūpa Gosvāmin, an authority on Beṅgāl Viṣṇuism who had direct contact with Caitanya.

SH. shows many similarities with JS., a *subhāṣita-saṁgraha* composed much earlier than SH. Several parts of JS. were quoted *in extenso* in SH.; on the other hand Harikavi must have known PG., since it also reproduced several verses from this *subhāṣita-saṁgraha*.

SRHt. and SSSN. are very similar and it is quite possible that SSSN. is another version of SRHt. or *vice-versa*. See JGJRI.28.3-4; pp. 167-200 and above fn. 13).

Between JS. and VS. the Vidagdhanavallabhā (Vjv.) could be inserted. This anthology was, according to V. Raghavan composed in the latter part of the 12th century or early in the 13th century (*Silver Jubilee Volume of the Journal of the Kerala University Or. MS Library*, 12; p. 154), but his dating based exclusively on the selection of authors by the compiler of this anthology (they belong to tea classic period and the latest is from the 10th century A.D.) is not a sufficient proof that the selection of authors by the compiler of this anthology (they belong to the classic this *subhāṣita-saṁgraha* is of such an early date. It seems that it would be safer to consider this anthology as having been written in the 15th century, for it has many common verses with VS.

20. For instance Vidy, quoted Kṛṣṇadatta, Kṛṣṇapati, Kṛṣṇānandaṭhakkura and many other authors who lived in Mithilā in the 18th or 19th century.

21. For instance, Gadādharaṇḍīya from Beṅgāl is only quoted in Skm. We find there as many as 35 verses of this poet.

22. Only in PG. are quoted Gauḍīya or Īśvarapuri, two poets from Beṅgāl.

23. Kalhaṇa from Kāśmīr is only quoted in VS. and Utpalārāja, also from Kāśmīr is quoted in SkV. and by Kṣemendra, a native of Kāśmīr.

24. For instance Gaṅgānanda, Gokulanātha, etc. See also fn. 20.

25. For instance, the southern recension of the Pañcatantra or the Vyāsaśataka.

8.3. Nevertheless, *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*, which are anthologies of stray verses *par excellence*, contain poetry of many poets, who lived in various times²⁶ and who are today either known or unknown; they often represent different branches of literature. Thus, we find in *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* next to each other old, classical as well as more modern authors, as well as authors who flourished in the North and in the South, in the East and in the West of India; we find there also poetry which belongs to epics and lyrics, as well as to medicine and descriptive literature, or to ethics and erotics.

9. Modern *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*, even if they contain some attributions to authors, which are based on ascriptions based on older *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*, are of no interest as a source of Sanskrit poetry, since their ascriptions are not original. To such *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* belong SR., SSB., SRK.²⁷ and partly SRRU., SSap. and SuMañ.²⁸ Also not yet edited *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* are of limited usefulness²⁹.

Other Sources than Subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s.

10. In addition to *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s sensu stricto*, also some collections of verses which are not anthologies but which contain « signed » verses of known and unknown authors, are useful as source of Sanskrit poetry. To these belong in the first place three works of Kṣemendra on poetics and prosody, as far as they, quote, with ascriptions to individual poets, verses of known and unknown Sanskrit poets; they are the *Aucityavicāracarcā*, the *Kavikanṭhābharana* and the *Suvṛttatilaka*; these works quote many verses of Kṣemendra himself, otherwise unknown, and of other poets written before 1066³⁰, in order to illustrate the points raised by Kṣemendra with regard to poetics and prosody. Of the same type are numerous *alaṅkāra-* and *nāṭya-śāstra-s*, but, since they quote generally as examples of their teachings verses without ascriptions to any authors, they cannot be, with some rare exceptions³¹, considered as sources of Sanskrit poetry.

26. For example, Venīdatta the compiler of PV. quoted Anandavarman, as well as a little known poet Akālaḥalada, who was the great-grand-father of Rājaśekhara, next to his contemporary Ghaṇaśyāma.

27. The other modern *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*, such as Sama., SRM., etc. do not contain ascriptions and, as such, cannot be considered as sources of Sanskrit poetry.

28. These three *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* contain sometimes original ascriptions.

29. But not, for instance, SH. which was clearly analysed (JGJRI 28.3-4; pp. 101-149 and The Rajasthan University Studies in Sanskrit and Hindi; No. 6; pp. 33-66), or SLP. which was used in the critical edition of BhŚ. and SkV.

30. It is known that the last work written by Kṣemendra, the *Daśāvatāracarita*, was written in 1066.

31. E.g. In some cases Dhanamjaya in his *Daśarūpa* ascribed some verses to individual poets.

11. In addition, some *prabandha-s* can also be considered as sources of Sanskrit poetry, for instance, the Bhojaprabandha (BhPr.), a work composed of anecdotes written in prose and in verse (including *samasyā-s*³²) regarding king Bhoja of Dhārā and the poets who supposedly lived in his court. Although many of these verses included in the Bhojaprabandha were ascribed to these poets, many of them could not have been composed by them; the importance of the ascriptions of verses to different poets in BhPr. lies, however, in the fact that they were by tradition considered as having been written by them³³.

12. *Subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*, which included ascriptions to individual poets, contain also ascriptions to works, rather than to authors (e.g. in SP., SRHt.). Only such works which were composed by authors quoted in the *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* can be usefully considered as sources of Sanskrit poetry, e.g. the Kāmandakīya-nītisāra or the Kalāvīlāsa of Kṣemendra, but not authorless poems, as for instance the Mahābhārata, or the Khaḍakośa, or the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa³⁴.

13.1. Another source of Sanskrit poetry are inscriptions³⁵, as far as they contain stanzas ascribed to known or unknown authors or as far as they are « signed ». Unfortunately the texts of the inscriptions are not easily available. They are scattered in different places, in different periodicals and publications, in addition to *Epigraphia Indica*, *Corpus Inscriptorum Indicarum*, etc.³⁶. Therefore, the list of authors quoted in inscriptions cannot be as complete as the list of poets quoted in *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*; the former list can be considered only as a selective one³⁷.

13.2. The value of the verses included in inscriptions is often exaggerated. Only rarely « signed » verses included in inscriptions have an important poetical value³⁸; they are mostly versified texts of grants, gifts and other legal acts and contain some versified invocations, eulogies

32. This game consists in completing in verse a stanza composed already in one part (one, two or three *pāda-s*).

33. For instance, a verse ascribed in the Bhojaprabandha to Kṛiḍācandra is also ascribed to Kṛiḍācandra in SP. However, Kṛiḍācandra is only a sobriquet of a poet called Candraka or Candaka (see V. Raghavan, JOR [Madras] 18.253) and M. B. Emeneau, *Signed Verses by Sanskrit Poets*, Indian Linguistic 10 (in Chatterji Jubilee Volume; p. 47-48).

34. To these belongs also the Prākṛit Gāthākośa; extracts from this work and from the Gāthāsaptasatī are often quoted in SRHt. These Prākṛit verses were rarely culled from Hāla's Gāthāsaptasatī. It is interesting to note that these verses are usually not repeated in SSSN (see fn. 19).

35. See also paras 22-26.

36. Not all verses found in inscriptions can be considered as poetry and, consequently, so also many inscriptions.

37. Already L. R. Diskalkar has shown how difficult it is to complete a full list of poets known from inscriptions (JOIB. [1957] 7.76-88).

38. See para 26.

and commendative or eulogistic stanzas of doubtful poetical value; only very rarely they represent real poetry. They are however of some importance to the histories of Sanskrit literature, since most of them are clearly dated.

Attributions to Authors

14.1. Twenty classical and some younger *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*, mentioned before³⁹, contain ascriptions to individual poets. These ascriptions are, generally, included at the end of the verses⁴⁰. Unfortunately, the ascriptions to poets are not always reliable; they are often deceptive and even misleading.

14.2. Already F. W. Thomas in his introduction to the *Kavindravacanasaṁuccaya*, warned that not too much weight should be allowed to ascriptions, so often carelessly set down. Also M. B. Emeneau stressed that « signed verses », i.e. verses which contain ascriptions to different poets, seem with varying degrees of probability to be attributable to the poets to whom they are ascribed⁴¹.

15.0. I. The greatest difficulty consists in the ascriptions themselves. How many verses before the ascription *ete* and the name of the author should be considered as having been ascribed to a given author?

15.1. If the ascription says, for instance, *etau Kṣemendrasya*, it is clear that two verses preceding this ascription were considered as having been composed by Kṣemendra; but if the ascription simply says *ete Kṣemendrasya* was it three, four, ten verses preceding this ascription? No authoritative answer exists to this question. P. Peterson, the editor of ŚP. and VS., considered all the verses preceding this ascription to the previous ascription as being composed by the author in question. This method is generally accepted, but not satisfactory, for it is often incorrect. Experience has shown that sometimes five or six verses preceding the ascription were composed by the author⁴², but not all the verses up to the preceding ascription.

15.2. If the ascription says only *Kṣemendrasya*, it is generally accepted that only this verse which precedes this ascription was written by Kṣemendra, but that again proves to be often wrong; sometimes more than one verse preceding this ascription were, in fact, written by Kṣemendra.

39. See para 9.

40. Sometimes also before the verse, e.g. in SH. or SLP.

41. *Signed Verses* (see fn. 33; p. 48).

42. Very rarely the compilers of *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* ascribe a specific number of verses to a poet. We find, for instance, ascriptions reading *ekādaśa Kṣemendrasya* (JS. 432.12) or similar ascriptions.

15.3. Such inaccuracies occur very often in *subhāṣita-saṃgraha-s* and each case must be considered individually; often, particularly as far as unknown authors are concerned, the question remains obscure and unresolved.

16.1. II. Another difficulty regarding ascriptions, is the double or multiple ascription of some verses to different authors in different *subhāṣita-saṃgraha-s*. These are cases when the same verse is ascribed to different poets, sometimes even seven different poets. And so, for instance, verse *ayaṃ vārām eko nilaya iti ratnākara iti* was attributed to Kavinanda or Nandīna in different MSs. of SkV.; to Kālidāsa in Prasanna.; to Vidyāpati in Skm. and Vidy., to Mālavarudra in ŚP.; to Vararuci in JS.; and to Bhallaṭa in SSSN. Only if it is possible to establish the origin of such verses, as for instance is the case of the verse quoted above⁴³, one of the ascriptions can be considered as correct, while the others must be rejected as false. In other cases of double or multiple ascriptions, the authorship of the verse remains doubtful.

16.2. It can be considered only as likely, that a verse which cannot be traced in a primary source, was composed by the author to whom it was ascribed, when the same ascription is repeated in two independent⁴⁴ *subhāṣita-saṃgraha-s* and if no alternate ascription exists. For instance, the verse *gādhālīṅganapūrvam ekamanayā dyūte* which is attributed in different *subhāṣita-saṃgraha-s* (JS., ŚP., RJ., SG. and SuSS.) to Uḍḍīyakavi⁴⁵ seems to have been really composed by that author, after all, completely unknown.

17.1. III. The third difficulty for considering ascriptions as reliable, is the fact that some ascriptions are to fictitious or imaginary authors; sometimes some words contained in the text of the *subhāṣita-s* were taken as the names of the authors. And so, for instance, the verse quoted in SkV. 117 (*vande bhujabhramitamandaramathyamāna*^o) is ascribed to Murāri because the verse ends with the word *murāreḥ*; or verse ŚP. 3420 (*viśrānto divasastaṭimaya*^o) is ascribed to Rudratī-panḍita because in the verse the word *rudratī* is cited. In another case, for instance, the name of a metre, became the author of the verse, e.g. verse *durdivase ghanatimire* was ascribed in Pad. and PV. to Jaghanacapalā⁴⁶, while that is the designation of the sub-division of an *āryā*-metre⁴⁷; in

43. This verse occurs in the Bhallaṭaśataka 105.

44. For instance SkV., Skm. and ŚP., but not SkV., Kav. and Prasanna (see fn. 11) or SRHt. and SSSN. (see fn. 19) or SH. and JS. (see fn. 19).

45. In SuSS. the name of the author is spelt Uddipakakavi.

46. Literally «a woman who shakes her buttocks»; or a «libidinous woman»; also a name of an *āryā*-verse, i.e. the *jaghana-capalā-āryā* (Nāṭyaśāstra 16.65; Regnaud 16.153).

47. M. B. Emeneau, op. cit. fn. 33; p. 41-52.

other cases, a sobriquet of an author⁴⁸ was taken as the name of the author. Also in many cases verses are attributed only in *maiores gloriam* to well known or mythical authors in order to convey the impression that the verse is of high moral value and of high antiquity to which special status should be accorded thanks to the venerability of its author⁴⁹. That is, in particular, the case of verses ascribed to Vyāsa or Vālmīki⁵⁰.

17.2. Sometimes, again, the author of the anthology purposely attributed the authorship of well known *subhāṣita-s* to an author whom he wanted to venerate and to be looked upon with higher esteem. That could be done however only in later *subhāṣita-saṅgraha-s* when the aphorism lost already its authorship. In such a way, for instance, Venīdatta in PV, attributed some Bhartṛhari's epigrams or wellknown *subhāṣita-s* quoted already in SkV., Skm., JS. or SP to his father Jagajjivana.

17.3. The names of the authors found in the ascriptions, are often not their own names. For instance, Aparādharaśundara is not the name of the poet, but a designation of an anonymous author, based on a devotional verse which utilized a *śleṣa* (JS. 460.12)⁵¹. Also Avilamba is not the proper name of the poet but a title of Mādhava-Sarasvatī; and Vyāsādāsa is a sobriquet of Kṣemendra. These names cannot be registered separately, but as Avilamba or Mādhava-Sarasvatī; and Kṣemendra or Vyāsādāsa.

18.1. IV. An additional difficulty in the utilisation of ascriptions is when the names of the authors quoted in different *subhāṣita-saṅgraha-s* are similar but not identical. For instance, the poet Kubjarāja is also designated as Kuñjarāja, or Rājakubja, or Rājakubjadeva, or Rājakubjadraṇa, or Kubjarājadraṇa⁵². Sometimes these differences in the names of the authors are due to different orthography (e.g. Arasiṭhakura, or Arasiṭhakkura, or Arasiṭhakura, or Arasiṭhkura, or Arasiṃhakura, or even Śriṭhakkura) or wrong memory or false oral tradition or, simply, carelessness of the scribe⁵³. And so, for instance, verse *ādāya vāri paritaḥ saritām* is ascribed in Vidy. 201 to Śuka; in SP. 1083 to Śrīśuka, in JS. 96.5 to Rīśuka or Rīśauka⁵⁴, while the same verse is

48. For example, Kaṇṇṭhapa, or Kūrmabārhata. See V. Raghavan, op. cit. fn. 33; p. 252.

49. Specially in case of didactic verses.

50. L. Sternbach, Vyāsa in *Subhāṣita-saṅgraha-s*. ABORI. 55; pp. 107-175.

51. V. Raghavan, op. cit. fn. 33; p. 252.

52. See above paras. 18.3 and 19.3.4.

53. A surprising error of the scribe (compiler) was, for instance, the ascription of a verse *saṃrambhādavibhāvitatribhuvanā* to two Purāṇa-s: Kūrma and Vāraha, while the verse was ascribed in reality to Kūrmabārhata. See fn. 48.

54. The same poet is also known under the name of Rissaka.

ascribed in Auc. to Bhaṭṭendurāja. Due to different orthography the poet Āvantikadravya is also known as Avantikadravya or even Āvantikadhanya. As we see here, and, particularly, before, with regard to Kubjarāja, the changes in the names of poets are often due to additions to their names of different suffixes and prefixes.

18.2. The addition of suffixes and prefixes to the names of the poets, which change sometimes their names radically, occur very often in *subhāṣita-saṅgraha-s*. The most popular suffixes are ⁵⁵: -bhaṭṭa, -ācārya, -śrīācārya, -bhāgavad, -bhadanta, -rājānaka, etc. And so, the author Bhaṭṭendurāja is identical with Indurāja and Tathagajendrasimha with Indrasimha and Gajendrasimha ⁵⁶.

18.3.1. Very often names of authors are written differently, but similarly, in one or another *subhāṣita-saṅgraha*. And so, for instance, the well known author of the Janakīharaṇa Kumāradāsa is also called in *subhāṣita-saṅgraha-s* Kumāradatta, or Nātha-Kumāra or even Kumāranayaka. If such differences exist between the various names, it is not certain whether they denote the same person, but in this particular case it was possible to trace the verses, apparently ascribed to different authors, in the Janakīharaṇa and conclude that Kumāradāsa is identical with Kumāradatta, Nātha-Kumāra and Kumāranayaka.

18.3.2. However, the small differences in the names of authors, may indicate sometimes different authors. For instance Govinda-kavi is different from Govinda-panḍita, from Govinda-candra, from Govinda-rāja, from Govinda-svāmin, from Govinda-bhaṭṭa and from Govinda-jid ⁵⁷.

18.3.3. Only if the same verse is ascribed in different *subhāṣita-saṅgraha-s* to authors who spell their names differently, it is possible to consider these different names as identical. And so, for instance, Acala is identical with Acalasimha (since the same verse is ascribed in SkV. to Acala and in Skm. to Acalasimha), with Acalanṛsimha (since the same verse is ascribed in different MSs. of Skm. to Acalasimha or to Acalanṛsimha), with Acaladāsa and Pracaladāsa (since the same verse is ascribed in SkV. and Kav.) to Acala and in different MSs. of Skm. to Acaladāsa or Pracaladāsa), as well as Acalarudra (since the same verse is ascribed in SP. and PG. to Acala and in Rasakalpadruma of Caturbhujā to Acalarudra ⁵⁸). Similarly Kamālākara is identical with Kamālayuddha ⁵⁹.

55. Many of them can also be used as prefixes.

56. See para 18.2. To the contrary, these prefixes and suffixes can also sometimes denote different authors.

57. It is not certain whether Govindabhaṭṭa quoted in SRHt. and SSSN. is identical with Govindabhaṭṭa quoted in PG. and Govindabhaṭṭa quoted in PV.

58. According to NCC1. 68 Rasakalpadruma was never edited and therefore, could not be verified.

59. The verse *karikavalitamṛṣṭaiḥ śākhī* is ascribed to Kamālākara in JS. and to Kamālayuddha in SkV. and Skm.

18.3.4. Many such examples could be quoted. Such identifications of different names of authors can never be made automatically. And so, for instance verse *kārerīkarivemallahari*⁶⁰ which in SuSS. is ascribed to Kṛṣṇapaṇḍita and in JS. and ŚP. to Kṛṣṇapilla, shows that Kṛṣṇapaṇḍita is identical with Kṛṣṇapilla, for we find in ŚP. and in JS. also other verses specifically ascribed to Kṛṣṇapilla and in PV., SSS., SH. and SuSS other verses specifically ascribed to Kṛṣṇapaṇḍita; besides, SuSS. is not a *subhāṣita-saṁgraha* very worthy of confidence, as far as ascriptions contained in this anthology are concerned.

18.4. It is obvious that this different nomenclature used for designation of authors to whom verses are ascribed, with prefixes and/or suffixes, or without them, cause great confusion and uncertainty for the proper identification of Sanskrit poets.

19.0. V. This confusion increases even more, because some poets, bearing the same name are sometimes different persons⁶⁰.

19.1. And so, for example, Govardhana or Govardhana-ācārya quoted in Skm., is probably different from Govardhana quoted in JS., ŚP., Prasanna., PG., SH., RJ., SG., Pd. and Vidy., the latter being the author of the Āryāsaptaśatī. The verses of Govardhana, the author of the Āryāsaptaśatī, as the title of the work indicates, are written in *āryā*-metre; on the other hand, verses of Govardhana or Govardhana-ācārya quoted in Skm. are written in different metres, mostly long metres; in addition, it must be emphasized, that none of the verses of the Āryāsaptaśatī are quoted in Skm.⁶¹ It seems, that on the basis of metrics alone, it is possible to differentiate between the two Govardhana-s.

19.2. But not only the exterior characteristics of the verse are criteria for the differentiations between authors bearing the same name; also the contents of the verse and its style can be utilized for such an identification. And so, Govindarājadeva quoted in ŚP. 3261 is probably different from Govindarājadeva quoted in ŚP. 87, JS., VS., PdT. and RJ. The first Govindarājadeva, as the contents of the verse shows, was probably an author of a treatise on medicine, while the second Govindarājadeva, quoted in ŚP. and other *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*, was a lyrical poet. So also Govinda, quoted in PG., who was a devotee of Kṛṣṇa, is probably different from Govinda, quoted in Skm. who does not show the same leanings.

19.3. Sometimes, contrary to what was said before⁶², suffixes and prefixes indicate different authors. Kumāra quoted in PG. seems to

60. Already mentioned before.

61. Śrīdharaśāstra probably did not know Govardhana, the author of the Āryāsaptaśatī or considered him as an author not worthy to be quoted.

62. See para 18.

be different from Kumārabhaṭṭa quoted in SkV., ŚP. and VS. and Kumārabhadanta quoted in SH. In this case an important role plays the fact that the three Kumāra-s occur in three different groups of *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*. Kumāra is quoted exclusively in PG. but not in SkV., ŚP., VS. and SH.; Kumārabhaṭṭa is quoted in SkV., ŚP. and VS. only, but not in PG. and SH.; and Kumārabhadanta is quoted only in SH., but not in PG., SkV., ŚP. and VS. Consequently, several entries quoted in NCC. should be changed accordingly.

19.4. On the other hand, it is possible to come to the conclusion on the basis of the analysis of different *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*, that authors bearing the same name, considered as different persons, are in some cases the same persons. And so, for instance, Kṛṣṇabhaṭṭa quoted in ŚP and registered in NCC4. 334b is the same person as Kṛṣṇabhaṭṭa quoted in SkV. and noted in NCC4. 335b, since the same verse *kavayaḥ kālidāsādyah* attributed in both *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* to Kṛṣṇabhaṭṭa is found in ŚP. 175 and in SkV. 1713, as well as in SH 312, RJ. 1410, etc.⁶³.

19.5. There are no strict rules for the identification of the names of the authors bearing the same or similar names and each case must be analysed on its merits.

20. VI. An additional difficulty in considering the ascriptions as reliable, is the fact that the compilers of *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* themselves often confounded different authors. And so, for instance, Kṣe-mendra is often confounded by the compilers of anthologies with Kṣe-meśvara or Kṣemiśvara; Amaru(ka) with Amara, or Amarasimha, or Amarānada, etc. This particular confusion is due to the resemblance of the names of different authors, but — what is more perplexing — some compilers confuse sometimes quite different authors bearing dissimilar names. And so, for instance, Jayadatta is often confused with Nakula (or vice-versa), for both were authors of treatises on horses and dealt with the same subject matter; Argata is sometimes confused with Ravigupta and Amara with Acala, Yogeśvara and even Dharmakīrti.

21.1. VII. The seventh and last, but probably the most important difficulty for giving credence to ascriptions, is the fact that the compilers often wrongly ascribed some verses to individual authors. In the first place, many verses are ascribed without any apparent reason to well known authors; on the other hand many verses are quoted anonymously, while we can prove now that they were composed by some well or less known authors; finally several verses are falsely ascribed to authors who have not written them. Sometimes it is possible to prove that some

63. The rectification of entries in NCC4. 304b and 335b is, therefore, necessary.

of the latter verses were composed by other poets to whom they were ascribed⁶⁴ and thus prove the falsehood of their ascriptions. In the latter cases the confusion is not exclusively due to the negligence or ignorance of the compilers or scribes, but also to their intention to ascribe some verses, showing common traces, to authors known to have written poetry of the same genre. Therefore, for instance, many so-called « erotic verses » are ascribed to Amaru(ka) and many ethical *subhāṣita-s* to the Mahābhārata.

21.2. Not all faults of wrong ascriptions can be attributed to compilers of the *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*; oral tradition played also an important role in the false ascriptions. A great number of verses which belonged to the floating mass of oral tradition were considered at the time of the compilation of *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* as composed by some known authors; the compilers followed only this tradition considering it as just and certain⁶⁵. That is the reason that many verses were ascribed to Vyāsa, as author of the Mahābhārata, or directly to the Mahābhārata, or to Kālidāsa, etc. It should also not be forgotten that a great part of well known verses ceased to be identified with individual authors and became the property of all, as today many proverbs and maxims. That was, particularly the case of so-called Bhartṛhari's epigrams or Cāṇakya's sayings⁶⁶.

21.3. It is also possible that some poems, written by poets to whom some verses included in *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* are ascribed, do not exist any more, since they got lost and, consequently, their verses became not traceable. Any way, that is the case of some works written by Kṣemendra; he himself ascribed many, otherwise unknown verse to himself (*mama*) or to his works specifically named by him, the existence of which is only known from his treatises on poetics and prosody.

64. Sometimes these ascriptions can be rectified; for instance, if a verse containing a false ascription can be traced in a primary source. E.g. verse *arijitya ya ātmānam* ascribed in SRHt. and SSSN. to Kāmandaka does not occur in the Nīṭisāra but can be traced in the MBh. (5.34.54 and 5.127.27); this verse is a MBh. verse which was wrongly ascribed to Kāmandaka. Sometimes it is not possible to trace a verse falsely ascribed in a primary source, but it occurs in a secondary source where it is ascribed to another author. If one of the secondary sources is more worthy of confidence than the other, it is likely that this ascription is the right one. And so, for instance, Auc. ascribes the verse *śītenoddṛṣitasya* to Karpaṭika, while ŚP. and the Rājatarāṅgiṇī ascribes it to Mātṛgupta. The ascription of Kalhaṇa (and Sārṅgadhara) seems to be more worthy of confidence, than that of Kṣemendra.

65. It should be borne in mind that at those times books did not exist yet and that poetry was transmitted by oral tradition.

66. See L. Sternbach, op. cit.

Inscriptions

22. It has already been mentioned⁶⁷, that selected inscriptions are another source of otherwise unknown poetry. Poets quoted in inscriptions are often older than those quoted in *subhāṣita-saṅgraha-s*. Almost all are unknown to histories of Sanskrit literature and to *subhāṣita-saṅgraha-s*.

23. Rarely only poets known in *subhāṣita-saṅgraha-s* are also quoted in inscriptions. That is, for instance, the case of Umāpati(dhara) or Chittapa. Umāpati(dhara) is a poet from Bengal who lived in the twelfth century. He speaks of himself, in the Deopāra inscription (verse 35), as a poet « whose understanding has been refined by the study of words and their meanings ». He is also mentioned by Jayadeva in his Gitagovinda (1.4) as a prolific author « who lengthens verses by addition of adjectives », as well as by Merutuṅga in his Prabandhacintāmaṇi, as minister of king Lakṣmaṇasena of Beṅgāl. He is mentioned in Skm. as author of the Candracūḍamaṇi (Skm. 2141), an otherwise unknown work, and appears also as author of the inscription from Deopāra containing the Vīyasena *praśasti*; it is composed of 36 verses⁶⁸. In addition, 109 verses of Umāpati(dhara) are preserved in *subhāṣita-saṅgraha-s* (Skm., JS., PG., SH., Vidy. and Regnaud II, VI), of which four appear also in the Deopāra inscription⁶⁹ and two in the Mādhanaigar inscription⁷⁰ of Lakṣmaṇasena. The latter inscription is little known and is badly preserved; it is an inscription on two copper-plates written in prose and in verse. After the twelfth verse, the inscription is often illegible and seems to have been written in prose only. The colophon, if it ever existed, is completely illegible, so that it is impossible to know by whom and when the inscription was composed. It was suggested that some parallels exist between this inscription and the Deopāra inscription⁷¹, but the language in both inscriptions is different and, therefore, it is difficult to come to the conclusion that Umāpati(dhara) was also the author of the Mādhainagar inscription⁷². It is, however, certain that the Deopāra inscription was composed by Umāpatidhara, since it is so clearly stated in the colophon of the latter inscription.

67. See para. 12.1.

68. Though this *praśasti* contains several verses dealing with the genealogy of the Sena kings, the verses quoted there have poetical value. Four of the verses of the *praśasti* are also included in Skm. (1114,1455,1395,1454 = *praśasti* 7,23,24,30); two verses are of little poetical value; they contain the colophon only (verses 35-36).

69. E.I. 1.307-311; JASB. (1865) 142-154, etc.

70. *Inscriptions of Bengal*, ed. by R. C. Majumdar, Vol. III. Rajshahi 1929; pp. 106-115.

71. For instance, between verses 4 and 6 of the Mādhainagar inscription and verses 5 and 16 of the Deopāra inscription (JASB. 5 [1909]; p. 409 and *Inscriptions from Bengal*, op. cit. [fn. 70]; p. 107).

72. The two verses of Umāpati(dhara) which occur in the Mādhainagar inscription and Skm. 1613 and 569 can be reconstructed according to Skm.

24. While the Deopāra inscription, shows a relatively high poetical standard, other inscriptions are, in general, of little importance from the poetical point of view. There are, however, several exceptions to this rule⁷³, e.g. the Nāna inscription of 1287, written by Amara of Buṇḍelkand (who has nothing in common with Amara quoted in JS., or Amara-candra, or Amaradatta, or Amarasimha, or Amaru[ka]), the Pṛtvideva II inscription from Koni written by Kāśala, or the Govindapur inscription written by Gaṅgādhara. or the Kumāradevī inscription of Kunda, or the Ratnadeva III and Jajalladeva II inscription written by Kumārapāla and several others.

25. Generally, however, inscriptions — in addition to versified genealogies, texts of grants, contain only versified invocations, eulogies, etc. which rarely have a poetical value and cannot be considered as real poetry.

26. Despite their limited poetical value, the inscriptions are important as sources of Sanskrit poetry, because (1) almost all are signed and dated; (2) they contain sometimes some information about the literary activity of their authors, otherwise unknown; and (3) they contain some verses of well known or less known poets with new readings. And so, for instance, we learn from the inscription by Kṛṣṇa Bālasarasvatī that he was also the author of an otherwise unknown, and not even mentioned in NCC. poem, Kuvalayāśvacaritā, or of unknown readings of verses of Umāpati(dhara) quoted in *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* and preserved also in the Deopāra and Mādhainagar inscriptions. Also, for instance, the Mayinpāgan inscription (from Burma) quotes a verse of Kulaśekhara in another version than that preserved in the Mukunda-mālā and in Skm. Since this inscription is from the middle of the 11th century⁷⁴, the date *ad quem* of Kulaśekhara must be rectified to the middle of the eleventh century.

Résumé

27. The value of *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* as sources of Sanskrit poetry consists, in the first place, in the preservation of poetry of poets unknown or little known which would have disappeared completely if it would not have been included in the *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*. Even their names would not have been known to us. In the second place, the value of *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* lies in the preservation of poetry of known poets in the form often unusual, or simply different from that known today. So, we come to know the poetry of known authors in the cur-

73. For example, verse *śatrunāpi kṛto dharmah* of Ayyapillārya from the 12th century which is a *subhāṣita*.

74. E.I. 7.197-199.

rently known form at the time and region when and where the respective authors of the *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* have prepared their compilations.

28. *Subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* have also an additional value; they can be considered as a barometer of the popularity of the verses quoted in them. And so, if a verse is quoted in several *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* and, particularly, in *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* belonging to different regions of India and composed in different times, it proves that the particular verse was generally known and accepted by the Sanskrit speaking intelligentsia and universally quoted; if it was a sententious verse it became often a property of all and became a generally known saying which, frequently, lost even its authorship.

29.0. *Subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* and inscriptions contain some 2,000 names of poets, plus over 100 titles of different works.

29.1. The poets quoted in *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* and, particularly, authors of inscriptions are in their majority unknown poets and many of them are not even mentioned in histories of Sanskrit literature; in addition, we come across some well known names of poets, e.g. Abhinanda, Amaracandra, Amaru(ka), Aśvaghoṣa, Ānandavardhana, Kalhaṇa, Kāmandaka, Kālidāsa, Kumāradāsa, Kusumadeva, Kṛṣṇamiśra, Kokkoka, Kṣemeśvara, Kṣemendra, Gadadhara, Govardhana, to mention only a few. Particularly, these well known poets are frequently quoted in *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* and some of them are represented in different *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* by hundreds of verses, while the other, unknown or less known, authors are represented usually in one or two different *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* by one, two or three verses only. In many cases we do not have any information about these authors, who they were, and when they lived. Many of them are not even mentioned in the recently published NCC.

29.2. In the case of well known authors, the majority of their verses can be traced to their known works, but not all; this, errors excepted, can be either due to the fact that the verses were falsely ascribed to the authors quoted in *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*, or their works were lost and not yet found. The « new verses » of well known poets are quite important to the history of Sanskrit literature, because they show us what additional poetry, even if in fact not composed by the authors to whom they were ascribed, were considered by tradition as having been composed by them. We also discover in them otherwise unknown poetry.

29.3. On the other hand, errors were often committed by the compilers of *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*, since they themselves did not know the authorship of many verses which they quoted. In many cases we find there verses of well known poets anonymously, while it is possible now to trace them in several primary sources. Many such verses are found

in *subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s*, as, for instance, those culled from Kokkoka's Ratirahasya, Kāmandaka's Nītisāra, Kṛṣṇamiśra's Prabodhacandrodaya and many others.

30. *Subhāṣita-saṁgraha-s* and, to a lesser extent, inscriptions open to us a new vista on Sanskrit poetry written between the tenth century of our era, upto the nineteenth century.

ABBREVIATIONS

- Auc. = Aucityavicāracarcā of Kṣemendra. Kāvya-māla I.; pp. 115 sqq.
- BhŚ. = Satakatrāyādi-subhāṣita-saṁgraha of Bhartṛhari. Śiṅhī Jain Series 23.
- E.I. = *Epigraphia Indica*.
- JGJRI. = Journal of the Gaṅganātha Jhā Research Institute (now Sanskrit Kendriya Vidyapeetha).
- JOIB. = Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda.
- JS. = Sūktimuktāvalī of Bh. Jalhaṇa. Gaekwad Sanskrit Series 82.
- Kav. = Kavīndravacanasamuccaya. *Bibliotheca Indica* 1309.
- MBh. = Mahābhārata. Poona edition. 1927-1966.
- NCC. = New Catalogus Catalogorum. University of Madras. 1949.
- Pad. = Padyaracanā of Lakṣmaṇa Bhaṭṭa Āṅkolakara. Kāvya-māla 89.
- PdT. = Padyāmṛta-taraṅgiṇī of Haribhāskara. Saṁskṛta-kośa-kāvya-saṁgraha 4.
- PG. = Padyāvalī of Rūpa Gosvāmin. Dacca University Oriental Publication Series 3.
- Prasanna. = Prasannasāhityaratnākara, as quoted in SkV.
- PV. = Padyaveṇī of Veṇīdatta. Prācyavāṇi-Mandira-Saṁskṛta-granthamālā 1.
- Regnaud II, VI. = Stances sanscrites inédites. Bibliothèque de la Faculté des Lettres de Lyon, Vol. II.2; pp. 193-212; and Vol. VI., pp. 1-85.
- RJ. = Rasikajīvana of Gadādhara Bhaṭṭa. Prācyavāṇi Mandira-Saṁskṛta-granthamālā, Sanskrit Text Series, Vol. II.
- Sama. = Samayocitapadyaratnamālikā, Haridass Sanskrit Series 165; and Bombay 1957.
- SG. = Sabhyālaṅkaraṇa of Govindajit. Prācyavāṇi Gopal Chander Law Memorial Skt. Series 4.
- SGD. = L. Sternbach, Subhāṣita, Gnostic and Didactic Literature. A History of Sanskrit Literature, ed. by J. Gonda, Vol. IV. O. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 1974.

- SH. = Subhāṣitahārāvalī of Harikavi. MS. BORI 92 of 1883-84. Cf. JGJRI. 28. (cf. fn. 29).
- SkM. = Sad-ukti-karṇāmṛta of Śrīdharadāsa. Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, Calcutta 1965.
- SkV. = Subhāṣita-ratna-koṣa. Harvard Oriental Serie 42.
- SLP. = Śṛṅgārālāpa. MS. BORI. 92 of 1883-84.
- ŚP. = Śārṅgadhara-paddhati. Bombay Sanskrit Series 37.
- SR. = Subhāṣita-ratna-bhāṇḍāgāram, 8th ed., Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, Bombay 1952.
- SRHt. = Sūktiratnahāra of Sūrya. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 141.
- SRK. = Subhāṣita-ratnākara, ed. by K. Ś. Bhātavaḍekar, Bombay 1872.
- SRM. = Subhāṣitaratnamālā. Poona 1912 and 1923.
- SSB. = Subhāṣita-sudhā-ratna-bhāṇḍāgāram, Bombay *saṁvat* 1985.
- SSS. = Sūktisundara of Sundaradeva. Saṁskṛta-koṣa-kāvya-saṁgraha 4.
- SūMañ. = Sūktimañjarī compiled and explained by Baldeva Upādhyāya, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, The Vidyābhavana Sanskrit Granthamālā 142.
- SuSS. = Subhāṣitasārasamuccaya. MS. Asiatic Society of Bengal 105666, as quoted in PV., PdT., SSS.
- Vidy. = Vidyākarasahasraka of Vidyākara Miśra. Allahabad University Publications. Sanskrit Series 2.
- VS. = Subhāṣitāvalī of Vallabhadeva. Bombay Sanskrit Series 31.
- ZDMG. = Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.